

REMARKS

Claims 1-25 were pending in this application. All claims were rejected. Claims 4, 11, 20, 23 and 24 have been amended herein. Claim 25 has been canceled. Reconsideration of the rejections of all pending claims is requested.

I. Defective Declaration

The office action states that the declaration is defective because it was not signed. The application was filed with an unsigned declaration. However, in response to a notice of missing parts, a signed declaration was timely filed on or about January 31, 2002. A copy of the signed declaration is attached hereto along with the Notice to File Missing Parts, the transmittal form, and the returned postcard from the PTO.

II. Rejection of Claims 4 and 25 Under 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph

Claims 4 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 4 as amended herein overcomes the rejection. It is noted that the amendment to claim 4 was made solely to correct a typographical error and was not made to overcome the prior art.

Claim 25 has been cancelled herein.

Based on the foregoing, the applicants contend that the rejections have been overcome and request reconsideration of the rejections.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

III. Rejection of Claims 25 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claim 25 has been cancelled herein. Accordingly, this rejection is moot.

IV. Rejection of Claims 1-24 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Chapa (U.S. 6,021,445) in view of Xu (U.S. 5,848,420).

CLAIM 1

Claim 1 is reprinted as follows for convenience:

A memory device for use by an electronic appliance, said memory device comprising:

a first data port operatively connectable to said electronic appliance;

a second data port operatively connectable to a remote memory device;

a data storage portion; and

a data allocation device operatively connected to said first data port, said second data port, and said data storage portion;

said data allocation device being adapted to:

allocate a portion of memory within said remote memory device for use by said electronic appliance; and

route data between said first data port, said second data port, and said data storage portion.

According to the office action, Chapa discloses all the elements of claim 1 except coupling an electronic device to the memory device, which is referred to as a terminal (12) in Chapa. The office action states that this coupling is disclosed by Xu.

The office action also states that the terminal (12) of Chapa teaches the memory device of claim 1. With regard to the "first data port" claimed in claim 1, the office action states that it is inherent in Chapa and gives an example of a USB port. However, the data allocation device recited in claim 1 is connected to the first data port and is adapted to allocate a portion of memory within the remote memory device for use by the electronic appliance. There is no first data port disclosed in Chapa, therefore, there can be no data allocation device as claimed in claim 1. The applicants respectfully contend that it would not be inherent for Chapa to have the above-described port wherein the memory allocation device functions as claimed with the port.

In addition, the data allocation device of claim 1 is adapted to, among other elements, "allocate a portion of memory within said remote memory device for use by said electronic appliance" and "route data between said first data port, said second data port, and said data storage portion." There is no disclosure in Chapa related to allocating a portion of a remote memory for use by the electronic device, which is connected to the "inherent" first port. More specifically, there is no disclosure in Chapa related to the terminal (12) allocating memory in the server (16) for use by an appliance connected to an inherent port on the terminal (12).

Therefore, regardless of whether Xu teaches connecting an appliance to a computer, there is no disclosure related to the claimed allocation of memory. Accordingly, the reference taken individually and in combination cannot render claim 1 obvious.

Based on the foregoing, the rejection has been overcome and the applicants request reconsideration of the rejection.

CLAIMS 2-10

Claims 2-10 are dependent on claim 1 and are deemed allowable by way of their dependence and for other reasons. Therefore, the applicants request reconsideration of the rejections.

CLAIM 11

Claim 11 is independent and was rejected on the same grounds as claim 1. Thus, the applicants incorporate the rebuttals to the rejection of claim 1 into this rebuttal of the rejection of claim 11.

Claim 11 is reprinted as follows for convenience:

An electronic device comprising:

a processor;

a memory device operatively connectable to said processor;

said memory device comprising:

a port operatively connectable to a remote memory device;

a data storage portion; and

a data allocation device operatively connected to said port and said data storage portion;

said data allocation device being adapted to:

allocate a portion of said remote memory device for use by said processor; and

route data between said processor, said data storage portion, and said remote memory device, **wherein cache data is routed to said data storage portion.**

Some portions of claim 11 that are not disclosed by the combination have been printed above in bold type.

Claim 11 claims, among other elements, a memory device comprising a data allocation device. The data allocation device is adapted to "route data between said processor, said data storage portion, and said remote memory device, wherein cache data is routed to said data storage portion" among other elements. It is noted that Chapa discloses a data buffer. However, simply showing a data buffer does not

disclose that cache data is routed to a data storage portion in a memory device as claimed in claim 1. There is no disclosure in Xu related to storage of cache data as claimed in claim 1. Therefore, the cited references cannot render claim 11 obvious.

Based on the foregoing, the rejection has been overcome and the applicants request reconsideration of the rejection.

CLAIMS 12-19

Claims 12-19 are dependent on claim 11 and are deemed allowable by way of their dependence and for other reasons. Therefore, the applicants request reconsideration of the rejections.

CLAIM 20

Claim 20 is independent and is reprinted below for convenience:

A method for operating an electronic appliance, said method comprising:

- establishing a data connection between said electronic appliance and a memory device, said memory device comprising a data storage portion and a data allocation device;

- establishing a data connection between said memory device and a remote data storage device;

- allocating a portion of memory of said remote data storage device for use by said electronic appliance;

- transmitting data from said electronic appliance to said memory device; and

- allocating said data to be stored in either said data storage portion or said remote data storage device using said data allocation device.

Claim 20 was rejected on the same grounds as claim 1. Therefore, the applicants incorporate the rebuttals to the rejections of claim 1 into this rebuttal.

Claim 20 has been amended in order to illustrate that the claim is directed toward operating an electronic appliance. Examples of appliances, such as digital cameras and PDAs are provided in the specification. As set forth above, the cited references do not teach a memory device establishing a connection to an electronic appliance and a memory device as claimed in claim 20. It follows that the cited references cannot teach allocating data as claimed in claim 20. Therefore, the cited references cannot render claim 20 obvious.

Based on the foregoing, the rejection of claim 20 has been overcome and the applicants request reconsideration of the rejection.


CLAIMS 21-24

Claims 21-24 are dependent on claim 20 and are deemed allowable by way of their dependence and for other reasons. Therefore, the applicants request reconsideration of the rejections.

In view of the above, all of the pending claims are now believed to be in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
KLAAS, LAW, O'MEARA & MALKIN, P.C.

May 31, 2005

By: 
Robert Nelson
Registration No. 37,898
1999 Broadway, Suite 2225
Denver, CO 80202
(303) 298-9888

Docket No. 10011520-1

13